

Remarks

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, and 4 - 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application US 2002/0184324 to Carlin ("Carlin") in view of U.S. Patent 7,225,170 to Ryan ("Ryan").

Independent claims 1, 5, and 6 each recite elements which are not disclosed in either of the asserted references. Thus, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been made and these rejections should be withdrawn.

In particular, the asserted references fail to disclose features related to the recited inclusion of "separate communications to separate individual recipients at a given delivery address in the particular mail piece." (Claim 1). Claim 4 recites forming mail pieces wherein "at least some of the completed mail pieces including more than one individual communications per envelope sent to a particular address". Similarly, claim 6 recites "including separate communications to separate individual recipients at a given delivery address in the particular mail piece."

These separate communications in a single mail piece are distinguished from each other for tracking purposes by the "communication identifier" that is different for different communications. The "mail piece identifier," also recited in the claims, is different from the communication identifier, in that it does not distinguish between individual communications that can be in a same mail piece. The recited combination of the "mail piece identifier" and "communication identifier" provide enhanced capabilities for situations where multiple communications are included in single mail pieces.

Neither Carlin nor Ryan describes mail pieces having multiple communications. Accordingly, neither Carlin nor Ryan discloses a "communication identifier" providing a further level of detail unavailable in a "mail piece identifier."

For these reasons it is submitted that claims independent 1, 5, and 6 and dependent claim 4 are allowable in view of the asserted references.

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected over Carlin and Ryan in further view of U.S. Patent 7,003,133 to Lhomme ("Lhomme"). Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1. Lhomme does not cure the deficiencies identified above with respect to claim 1, and it is therefore submitted that claims 2 and 3 are allowable for the same reasons as given above for claim 1.

Claim 7 stands rejected over Carlin and Ryan in further view of U.S. Patent 7,085,775 to Short ("Short"). Claim 7 depends from independent claim 6. Short does not cure the deficiencies discussed above, and is cited in connection with other features. Accordingly, claim 7 should be allowable over the asserted references for the same reasons described above.

All rejections have been addressed. It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and favorable action is requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Cummings/
Michael J. Cummings
Reg. No. 46,650
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000